

May 14, 1965

[From the Erie (Pa.) Morning News, Feb. 22, 1965]

HUMANE TREATMENT ASKED

Senator JOSEPH CLARK has introduced a bill (S. 1071) to require humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by the Federal Government and by institutions receiving grants from the Government.

Emphasizing that the bill is not an anti-vivisection measure, Senator CLARK cites the British experience with similar legislation which has been in effect for almost 90 years.

The proposed legislation should have the support of all men, liberal and conservative, who are concerned about the kind of record our civilization is making in caring for helpless, speechless, voteless animals who can form no pressure group or lobby of their own.

Senator CLARK points out that this bill must rely entirely on the compassion of those who can speak out and vote, humane Americans.

Research in the biological sciences have given millions of Americans added years of life. But needless suffering by dumb animals must not be condoned.

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, Mar. 6, 1965]

RELATED AID FOR ANIMALS

A minor phenomenon worthy of encouragement is taking place in the U.S. Senate.

Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia—who seldom agree on political matters—have joined as cosponsors of a bill.

S. 1071, introduced by Senator CLARK, February 9, is modeled on British law dating back to 1876, requiring humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in scientific research.

This is not an anti-vivisection bill. "I would not introduce or support any measure to outlaw or curtail research which is responsibly and humanely conducted," Senator CLARK comments.

His bill, while recognizing that research involving animals can not be made entirely painless, would set up commonsense rules for laboratories receiving Federal funds.

Scientists intending to use live animals in research would receive individual licenses which could be withdrawn from anyone responsible for inhumane treatment;

There would be periodic, unannounced inspections by qualified persons with access to animal quarters, laboratory facilities and records;

Adequately sized cages, periodic removal for exercise and cleaning, and proper feeding, would be required for animals held for research purposes.

Animals suffering lasting pain following experiments would have to be put out of their agony instead of being used repeatedly for experiments.

Senator CLARK himself provides the best summary of why Federal legislation on this subject is desirable.

"There is no need for a country as idealistic as the United States to condone the suffering which great numbers of these animals undergo before they die. This needless suffering does nothing to advance science or human welfare. . . . Research performed on unhealthy animals accompanied by unnecessary pain contributes to scientific error, wasted funds, confusion in scientific literature. . . ."

"Research in the biological sciences now receives more support from the U.S. Government than from any other source. It is our responsibility no longer to condone needless suffering."

Senator CLARK's bill is now in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, is chairman.

Last year, a similar bill died in committee because animal dealers who favor the status quo demonstrated more interest than those who would like the bill passed. The fate of such proposals is one guideline by which American civilization can be judged.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Feb. 27, 1965]

FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Both Senator BYRD of Virginia and Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, are Democrats, but beyond that point their political ideologies sharply diverge. Hence it is interesting, and somewhat impressive, to find them cosponsors of a piece of legislation.

Last year CLARK sponsored a bill to require humane treatment of laboratory animals by institutions receiving grants from the Federal Government. With BYRD and several other Senators he has reintroduced the bill this year.

This legislation would not prohibit vivisection. It would not outlaw or curtail scientific research which is responsibly and humanely conducted. Its sponsors say that State legislation on the subject is inadequate. They say that a Federal law is needed to end the suffering which many experimental animals undergo at present. As explained by the Washington Post, "It aims to do no more than to minimize needless, wanton suffering. It has been carefully drafted to avoid any impediment to rational scientific study; it is in no sense an anti-vivisection bill. It provides machinery for reporting and inspection designed to assure decent care of animals awaiting experimental treatment, anesthetization when this would not interfere with an experiment, and prompt dispatch of a dying animal to avoid unnecessary agony when the experiment has been completed."

Surely no one can quarrel with those objectives. CLARK's bill, S. 1071, is modeled after similar legislation in England which he says has been "an unqualified success for almost 90 years." Certainly, as he asks, public hearings should be held on this bill at this session of Congress and if they show it to be as meritorious as its sponsors believe, it should be enacted into law.

[From the Southern Pines (N.C.) Pilot, Mar. 4, 1965]

THEY HAVE NO LOBBY OF THEIR OWN

That great out-of-sight, out-of-mind issue—the humane treatment of experimental animals—is before Congress again with the introduction of a bill (S. 1071) in the Senate by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, with three other Senators as cosponsors.

The bill would require humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by the Federal Government and by institutions receiving grants from the Federal Government. Though this seems limited, it is not so limited as might appear, as most universities, hospitals, and other such institutions receive Federal aid in one form or another.

The proposed law in no way prevents or forbids experiments with animals. It simply calls for the curtailment of unnecessary suffering—suffering which investigation has proved to be widespread, ranging from cruel neglect of animals on whom experiments have been completed to needlessly uncomfortable conditions under which experimental animals are forced to live before and after they are used.

England has had such a law for nearly 90 years and there is no evidence that it has hampered research in any way. It is disgraceful that the United States, a nation famed for its humanitarian concerns, has allowed this gap in its laws to remain unclosed.

As Senator CLARK notes, animals can't speak for themselves. That is why all interested persons should write their own and

other Senators and Representatives in support of S. 1071.

[From the Mount Kisco (N.Y.) Free Trader, Feb. 28, 1965]

PROTECTING LABORATORY ANIMALS

As a nation, we know much more about what is right than we manage to put into practice. One of the fields where the gap between knowledge and observance is most glaring is laboratory experimentation with animals.

Under the guise of humanity to man, inhumanity to helpless animals is widely practiced. The need to try new remedies or techniques on animals before using them on human beings is not disputed here, but the omission of simple precautions to prevent unnecessary pain should not be tolerated.

Efforts to secure enactment of an effective animal protection law have so far failed, possibly because the voice of the humanitarians has been drowned by those of the medical lobbies. Such a measure has been introduced in Congress again this year by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania. Readers concerned with prevention of unnecessary suffering in our laboratories are urged to write to Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY, asking their support of S. 1701.

[From the Courier-Journal, Apr. 12, 1965]

A PROTECTIVE BILL FOR THE ANIMALS IN LABORATORIES

One of the marks of a civilized human being is a decent concern for the suffering of dumb animals. Carried to extremes, such an interest may become obsessive and hysterical. But callous disregard for the plight of dumb creatures put man himself in the category of the more savage beasts.

Some very practical people are lined up behind a bill in Congress which would regulate the treatment of laboratory animals. The measure is designated as S. 1071 in the Senate, H.R. 5647 in the House.

Its Senate sponsors include Senators CLARK, of Pennsylvania, BYRD of Virginia, MUSKIE, of Maine, and YOUNG of Ohio. This is a varied group politically. It demonstrates the accuracy of Senator CLARK's description of the bill: "This is not a liberal or a conservative, a right- or left-wing measure. It has broad ideological support."

The bill is being promoted by the Society for Animal Protective Legislation. This organization, led by a group of determined and devoted women, won the long fight that resulted in the humane slaughter bill. The direct consequences were predicted if that measure passed. It has now been on the books for several years without any observable adverse effects. The commercial slaughterhouses have learned to live with it. They are reported, in fact, to be operating more efficiently and profitably under its terms than under the old cruel system.

The humane slaughter bill was falsely assailed as anti-vivisection legislation. The same cry will be raised just as inaccurately, and even more strongly, against the laboratory bill.

THE TARGET: UNNECESSARY PAIN

The sponsors of this measure are in no way opposed to vivisection, under proper conditions. They are fully aware of the value of animal experimentation, which has often resulted in knowledge that saves human lives.

What the sponsors do demand is that laboratories which receive funds from the Federal Government submit to unannounced inspections; that they maintain decent conditions in animal cages and pens; and that they avoid unnecessary pain in their work with animals.

Hearings will probably take place soon on this measure. The interested public will want to read the testimony of experts in laboratory work. They may have sugges-

May 14, 1965

tions which could make the bill more easily workable, without lessening its humane effect. The public should avoid being misled, however, by the hue and cry which has little relevance to the provisions in the bill itself, but which might stall it for years, as happened in the case of the humane slaughter bill.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Apr. 1, 1965]

THE TIME IS NOW

After an inexcusably long delay, it now seems hopefully possible that Congress will act on one or more of the laboratory animal bills that have been introduced in session after session over a 5-year period and have, so far, perished in committee.

The argument for these bills is not antivivisection. It is whether animals used for medical and other experimentation shall have legal protection against wanton and unnecessary cruelty. Such cruelty is a matter of congressional record, brought out in House hearings in September 1962. There have been no further hearings and no action. While Congress has delayed and the public has been too quiescent, laboratory animals have been subjected to unthinkable shocking treatment, which many physicians and surgeons themselves condemn as unnecessary and cruel to the point of atrocity.

Unfortunately there are, among the current bills, several weak ones which would be literally worse than nothing. There are, however, three adequate bills which deserve public support and favorable congressional action. They are S. 1071, introduced by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and cosponsored by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, and Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine; H.R. 5647, introduced by Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, and identical with S. 1071; and H.R. 3036, introduced by Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

Any one of these bills would form a reasonable and sound basis for urgently-needed regulation.

Delay in this matter does no credit to Congress, to the committees in charge of hearings, or to the public, who, in the last analysis, is responsible. Now is the time for citizens (many of whose tax dollars, whether they like it or not, are channeled into animal experimentation partially financed by the Government) to demand of their lawmakers and executives that an adequate regulatory bill be passed by this Congress.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times Union,
Mar. 31, 1965]

AN IMPORTANT STEP

So many people have haggled for so long over so many theories on abolishing laboratory brutality to animals that no fully effective legislation has emerged. It is long overdue.

The greatest hope lies in the Clark bill, now in U.S. Senate committee. But it is a forlorn hope unless men and women, of conscience and compassion, act to keep it from dying there.

Here is a fundamentally realistic proposal which should appeal to all factions of the issue, either as a solution to the problem or an important step toward broader objectives.

This is not an antivivisection bill. It is no "bleeding heart" plea for an end to genuine research in which animals pave the way for human progress. But it does demand standards to spare these creatures avoidable pain, stress, and neglect, to which many are still subjected through carelessness or callousness.

Passage of the Clark bill would establish a law similar to that which has met with unqualified success in England for nearly

90 years. It would also pave the way for strengthening legislation by individual States.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Apr. 16,
1965]

RESEARCH ANIMAL USE NEEDS CONTROLS

A long, stubbornly waged campaign to get legislation that would prevent cruelty to animals used in U.S. research laboratories, medical schools, and industrial plants once again has been slowed to a stop in a congressional committee.

Testimony heard in other committees over the past few years indicates that animals used in experiments are abused and subjected to unnecessary suffering in many laboratories throughout the United States. There are virtually no controls at present over the use of animals in research and teaching.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has introduced legislation that would provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests. He introduced similar legislation in the two previous Congresses.

The present bill has languished in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare since early February. Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, the committee chairman, shows no inclination to schedule hearings.

Senator CLARK and the bill's cosponsors, Senators BARTLETT, of Alaska and BYRD, of Virginia, suggest that committee members fear such hearings might invite "overly excited testimony" from people who have strong feelings about defenseless dumb animals.

We suggest that it's time for excitement. A review of previous testimony and realization that nothing at all has been done about the conditions it revealed convinces us that excitement might be just what the situation calls for.

Until recent years the protest about lack of adequate controls over the use of experimental animals has been vigorous but unorganized. There has been a tendency on the part of many to remain deaf and blind to this cruel oversight because "scientific progress" is a far more attractive cause. Medical spokesmen have argued effectively that controls might impede such progress.

Also, pleas for more humane treatment of research animals historically have tended to become associated with avowed antivivisectionists and stereotyped do-gooders of women's clubs and societies.

But there has been considerable testimony, some of it from outstanding doctors and scientists, that control legislation would actually improve medical research and even save large sums of money now going into unnecessary experimentation.

As for the antivivisectionists, Senator CLARK is careful to point out his bill is not such a measure. It provides for licensing of laboratories which receive grants from Government agencies and for inspection of these labs to insure humane care and housing of the animals used in them, as well as for painless killing of animals which cannot be saved and which might otherwise suffer for a time after an experiment.

Medical and scientific research must continue unimpeded for man's health and benefit. But human carelessness and cruelty to animals apparently is frequently present in many areas of this research. We believe it is unnecessary.

Members of Congress and their constituents might easily overlook legislation like this in the presence of international crises and pressing domestic issues. But no matter involving the public conscience is unimportant, even relatively, and the use of experimental animals is certainly a matter of public conscience.

Senator CLARK's bill should get favorable action without further delay.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune,
Mar. 4, 1965]

SPEAK FOR OUR ANIMALS

The animals which live among us, our pets and livestock, cannot send a lobby to Olympia and the National Capital to speak up for their rights. They have to depend on us. As U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has said, they rely on the compassion of those men and women "who are concerned about the kind of record our civilization is making in caring for helpless, speechless, voteless animals who can form no pressure group or lobby of their own."

There are bills in both Congress and the Washington Legislature presently for legislation sorely needed on behalf of our animal friends. The one in Congress, S. 1071, requires humane treatment of animals penned up and used in scientific experiments calculated to prolong man's life on earth. The one at Olympia, Senate bill 230, calls for humane slaughter of animals used for food.

No one working for the congressional bill wants to impede the progress of science. But scientists have not all given adequate consideration to experimental animals, with the result that many are caged in cramped quarters and some suffer unnecessary pain before they are allowed to die. The bill would end this, and would not hurt the experiments.

There is a good national humane slaughter bill already. It applies, however, only to packing plants selling meat to the Federal Government. The senate bill at Olympia would put teeth in the present State law regulating all slaughterers in the State. It is based on a uniform State code proposed for all the States.

There must be many who would ask for support of this legislation. Those who care to do so might write Senator CLARK, Senator E. L. BARTLETT of Alaska, or Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG of Ohio. At Olympia the men to write, besides one's district senators, are Senator Dewey C. Donohue, chairman of the senate agricultural committee, and Senator Reuben Knoblauch, senate rules committee.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very much that hearings can be held on the bill before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, before this session adjourns.

The bill moves into a field allied with that covered by the humane slaughter bill which was passed under the strong urgings of an overwhelming majority of American citizens a good many years ago.

As the facts become known, showing the miserable treatment given to poor dogs and cats, and even rats, I am sure that public sentiment will rally in support of the measure, just as it did when the facts were made known with respect to methods of slaughtering cattle and sheep for human consumption.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last week, during debate on Vietnam, I tried to put our position in that country in proper perspective with our overall foreign policy. I indicated my own view that our foreign policy was obsolete because we were indulging in a series of myths and ignoring a series of harsh realities.

At that time, I suggested that to assist the President in finding a path toward a

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

peaceful settlement, I would suggest the extension of his offer of unconditional discussions made in his Johns Hopkins speech, which I endorsed.

The President has now come part way along the line which a number of Senators have recommended from time to time on the floor of the Senate. His excellent address of yesterday to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists has already been placed in the Record earlier today by the able Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGowan).

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire) also commented on the subject, and I should like to add my praise to theirs.

I am particularly happy to see the President comment that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side in South Vietnam.

We have been given an entirely too optimistic report by both military intelligence and USIA in South Vietnam. These unduly optimistic reports have led us to believe for the past several years that we were winning the war over there, that if we only persisted a little longer the Vietcong would be crushed and the North Vietnamese government with its capital at Hanoi would cease its efforts to assist the Vietcong, and we could at long last bring peace and the beginnings of prosperity to that unhappy land which has been in the grip of one war or another for more than 10 years.

Recent reports filed by reputable newsmen in South Vietnam make it clear, indeed, that we are not winning the war. In fact, we are slowly but surely losing it.

At the present time, our Vietnamese allies and American forces are very much on the defensive. We are attempting to prevent the Vietcong, with the assistance of their allies in Hanoi, from overrunning the entire country. There is very little territory outside the major cities of South Vietnam which face the sea which has not at one time or another during the day been under the control of the Vietcong.

Probably the principal reason why the Vietcong and Hanoi have been unwilling to negotiate up to this point is that they expect—foolishly, in my opinion—to win an overwhelming military victory over our forces and the forces of South Vietnam, just as they won an overwhelming military victory over the French troops at Dienbienphu.

They will not achieve that objective. I have gradually come to the reluctant conclusion that we must not permit them to attain that objective.

I have always agreed with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur that the United States never had any business going into Indochina. It is too far from our base of operations. It is too close to the natural sphere of influence of the Chinese. It is a country which has never known free government. It is a country which in the last 15 years has shown itself to be incapable of organizing and maintaining a strong government of its own. It is a country which is apparently incapable of protecting itself from the guerrilla

warfare of fellow Vietnamese, many from the south and a great many from the north.

But, nevertheless, we are there.

While I do not like to believe that Americans have the same sense of "face" as the Chinese, I do know that to withdraw now on a unilateral basis would be most damaging to the prestige of our country and would probably advance the cause of world communism.

As I have stated, I reluctantly conclude that for the time being, at least, we must stand and fight. We must protect the remaining areas of South Vietnam which are held by our allies the South Vietnamese. We must do what we can to minimize, if not eliminate, the frightening effects of the constant guerrilla warfare waged by the Vietcong, with the support of Hanoi.

The coming months in South Vietnam will be difficult, for the monsoon will be arriving. The weather will worsen. Guerrilla warfare will have an extra advantage. Our helicopters will be grounded. Our bombers will have difficulty finding their targets, and perhaps even have difficulty in landing. Therefore, we must pull in our belts and be prepared to show by force of arms that we are not going to be pushed out of South Vietnam.

I come to this conclusion with the greatest of reluctance. However, having come to it, I believe that we should intensify our efforts to get to the conference table.

The President said last night that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side. If we cannot persuade the North Vietnamese, the Vietcong, and the Chinese Communists on this point through the normal course of diplomacy, we shall have to do it, temporarily at least, by force of arms.

The President in his speech yesterday was eloquent, indeed, in enunciating once more his keen desire to achieve a peaceful solution, to get our present enemies around the conference table where we can deliberate and come to a sensible solution to this apparently never-ending war which is bringing great harm to all who are engaging in it.

It is to be hoped that through the many open channels for initiating negotiations we shall be able to come into contact with our enemies there and work out an arrangement whereby the two Vietnams can come to their own solution of the dispute between them.

One of the great difficulties which confront us is the instability of many of the governments in South Vietnam. It now appears that the present leader of that country, Premier Quat has a greater degree of popular support than some of his predecessors. He seems to be making progress in bringing together the many complex elements in that country.

We tend to oversimplify the situation in South Vietnam. This is an intensely complicated area of the world, where many currents and cross currents of different political views clash with each other, where the attempt to find a consensus is difficult indeed, where a Christian minority is charged with persecuting a Buddhist majority, where the various

sects and the different kinds of religious orders and civilian orders and secret societies give no indication of unity being feasible.

Nevertheless, I am confident that under the supervision of the major powers these two elements—these two governments, if we wish to call them such—in Vietnam can be brought together.

I say again what I said last week, that we should make it clear, in the course of our continuing search for a basis for negotiation and for peace, first, that we are willing to negotiate with Hanoi directly, or with any representative Hanoi may suggest. This inevitably means representatives of the Vietcong, without whose acquiescence no peaceful settlement in my opinion is possible.

The President once said he would not negotiate with the Vietcong. I urge him to reconsider that view. An easy way to bring this about would be to say to Hanoi, "When you come to the conference table, when you are ready to discuss unconditionally the bringing of peace in Vietnam, bring with you anyone you wish to bring." In that case we can be sure that representatives of the Vietcong would be at the conference table.

Second. We should indicate in advance our willingness to support free elections in all of Vietnam and our insistence that the elections in North Vietnam shall be free and under international supervision. These elections should be held for the purpose of determining whether or not either South or North Vietnam desires to unite in one country or whether they prefer to remain independent of each other divided by the 17th parallel.

If they should decide to come together in one government, the election should provide for a constitutional convention to draft and to have ratified by popular vote a constitution for a united Vietnam. We should be prepared, in that case, to support the results of those elections, no matter how they go. We should not attempt to dictate what kind of government two Vietnams or one Vietnam should have after the people have expressed their choice.

Third. And finally, in order to make it more likely that we can get to the negotiating table, when we turn over to the North and South Vietnamese the task of coming to an agreement with each other or agreeing to disagree on agreed terms, we should gradually decrease the bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and for a time at least they should be terminated. The predictable effect of the raids has been to harden the resolve of the North Vietnamese without impairing their fighting ability. It is forcing the Soviet Union into a more hostile role in southeast Asia. It is alienating our friends and aiding our enemies in Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America. It is probably a major force in preventing a solution of the Vietnamese problem around the conference table.

Again, Mr. President, I congratulate the President of the United States on his earnest efforts to seek peace. The speech he made last night represents a distinct advance on the road to peace. I hope

that advance will be met with some signal or sign from the other side.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times entitled "To H.C.M. from L.B.J." be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 14, 1965]
To H.C.M. From L.B.J.

President Johnson's speech on Vietnam yesterday could not have been more clearly addressed to Hanoi if it had been marked "attention Ho Chi Minh." It was an effort worth making even if it remains unanswered at present. For the mere attempt to talk intelligently at, if unfortunately not to, the adversary forces the formulation of ideas in a new and useful way.

In an administration that has generally emphasized the military approach, it is important that the President is now stressing—as many critics of administration policies have long insisted—that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." In his remarks yesterday, there was no unrealistic talk of "victory" or "winning the war" as there often has been in the words of his advisers.

The purpose to which he intends devoting "unlimited resources," Mr. Johnson indicates, is that of denying victory to the other side while seeking a negotiated settlement. This is a policy that is welcome and needs even more explicit clarification at a time when—after denials that any such decision had been made—additional American troops in large numbers are being sent to South Vietnam. At 46,500, the number of American troops there now is well over three times the pre-Johnson level.

The President yesterday drew a useful distinction between Hanoi and the Vietcong guerrillas, which seek "the fulfillment of Vietnamese nationalism," and Communist China, which seeks "domination over all of Asia" including, he implied, Vietnam. And in a tone new to Washington, Mr. Johnson observed that many of the "individual fighting men we must now, sadly, call the enemy," are trying "to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope" and to reach for "the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge." He urged Hanoi to pursue its own interests by coming to the conference table, freeing itself from the control of a China that wants to continue the war irrespective of the cost of China's allies.

It is in this context that the President has now indicated for the first time that once peace is restored, all forms of American aid—not just the fruits of a projected Mekong Valley development that might not touch North Vietnam directly—will be available to all the people of Vietnam, "north and south alike." The wise decision to help found an Asian Development Bank with, it is hoped, the backing of all industrialized nations including the Soviet Union, has evidently been taken on the recommendation of Eugene Black. It should open the way for the kinds of soft loans and long-term multilateral development aid needed in Asia's special circumstances, with which present American and United Nations machinery is unable to cope.

The President wields the country's vast influence most effectively when he voices, as he did yesterday, its desire to explore "every possible path" to peace. If he will but continue now to pursue honorable negotiations with the vigor and persistence he has applied to military measures, he will be on the road that is most likely to lead to the honorable settlement he and the American people clearly want.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I note in particular the comment in the editorial that the President has now indicated for the first time that once peace is restored, all forms of American aid—not merely the fruits of a projected Mekong Valley development that might not touch North Vietnam directly—will be available to all the people of Vietnam, north and south alike.

Mr. President, the enormous sums of money which we have spent during the past number of years to ameliorate the conditions of the people of South Vietnam should be taken note of by not only Americans, but by everyone interested in the southeast Asian dilemma. That great amount of money appears to have been to a substantial extent wasted, because of the condition of warfare in that country. Yet we do know, as the President has told us, that there are more schools, better health measures, better transportation arrangements, and a better rice crop. We also realize that conditions in Vietnam should come to the point where we would know that a people could live in peace and look forward to some prosperity.

I commend the President for his humanitarian and idealistic views as to the future of that part of the world. I hope and pray that he will be able to get us into negotiations for a settlement of the carnage, the death, the torture, and the warfare in that country within the very near future.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first I should like to offer for the Record a recent editorial published in the New York Times entitled "Government by Crisis." I ask that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS

The Dominican and Vietnam troubles disclose a serious weakness in this country's management of its foreign affairs. This weakness has been a long time developing and it will not easily be set right, but its many-sided nature and its implications deserve exploration.

The weakness is simply stated. Congress control of the warring power has been eroded almost to the point of invisibility. This development is readily understandable insofar as the waging of thermonuclear war is concerned. If the President learns that hostile atomic missiles have been launched against the United States, he has no time and no choice except to act in his unique capacity as Commander in Chief.

But it is guerrilla wars, undeclared wars, civil wars, and wars by subversion that now plague the world and are likely to continue as the chief difficulties in the years ahead. It is in this area of policymaking that the people's elected representatives in Congress have largely abdicated their constitutional responsibilities.

Speed is not the overriding consideration in making policy in these diverse difficulties. The war in Vietnam, for example, has been dragging on for several years and U.S. activity there has been intensifying for 9 months. Yet Congress has not conducted a

full, serious debate on American participation.

It is true, of course, that Congress has gone on record not once but twice. President Johnson has seen to that. Last August, after a now almost forgotten retaliatory air strike in the Gulf of Tonkin, and again last week, Congress dutifully countersigned what came close to being a blank check. In the case of the August resolution and of last week's \$700 million appropriation bill, there was a suddenly announced television speech by the President. Then came the submission of a hastily drafted proposal which the relevant committees of Congress approved with the flimsiest of hearings and which both Houses approved with no real deliberation.

From initiation to Presidential signature, each of these maneuvers took only 3 days. That is not constitutional procedure; it is a caricature of such procedure.

The Dominican trouble exemplifies congressional default in a different form. In October 1963, after a military junta overthrew President Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic, Senators Jacob Javits of New York and Wayne Moss of Oregon, introduced a resolution intended to set forth the sense of Congress on Latin-American dictatorships.

No action was ever taken on this resolution. Nor did the relevant House and Senate committees develop any congressional judgment on American policy in the event of future revolutions and coups in Latin America. When civil war erupted in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson acted in a vacuum, one partly of Congress' own making.

The problem long predates Mr. Johnson's Presidency. It first became evident in the failure of Congress to clarify its own responsibility for the waging of war in Korea, where war was never actually declared.

There are many present contributing influences to the diminution of congressional authority in policymaking, quite apart from Mr. Johnson's forceful assertion of leadership. One is Senator DIXON's extension of responsible bipartisanship into something that often approaches coalition government. Another is the reluctance of Senator FULBRIGHT to follow his independent ideas by asserting his full authority as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

But beyond these transient personal factors, there has been an institutional failure on the part of Congress to develop the new procedures and tradition necessary to protect its role in the making of foreign policy in a new age of international political warfare.

The nature of the cold war, the speed with which minor engagements can escalate, the extent to which secret information must help shape vital decisions—all these and many other factors have made the development of new procedures and practices difficult. But they have also made them essential if there is not to be a total erosion of Congress' authority in this field and an atrophy of democratic debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the editorial points out that both the Dominican and the Vietnamese troubles disclose a serious weakness in this country's management of its foreign affairs.

The editorial points out:

The weakness is simply stated. Congress control of the warring power has been eroded almost to the point of invisibility.

The editorial continues:

There has been an institutional failure on the part of Congress to develop the new procedures and tradition necessary to protect its role in the making of foreign policy in a new age of international political warfare.